Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

misinterpreted, being viewed as an imputed rather than an ethical transaction.

One question does not receive adequate attention, indeed is hardly more than touched upon. What authority has the apostolic teaching as compared with that directly attributed to Christ? Are the epistles authoritative *to us* as truly as are the four gospels? The lecturer would evidently answer the latter inquiry in the affirmative, but does not undertake to discuss the grounds on which that conviction rests.

The book is certainly a helpful contribution toward the solution of the problems suggested by the title. Their adequate solution, however, demands not only exegetical accuracy and doctrinal insight, but broad historical research. The second sentence in the opening lecture, "The material for the study lies within the boards of the New Testament," is only partially true. Hort would have put the case differently.

WM. ARNOLD STEVENS.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

---

DIE GRIECHISCHEN CHRISTLICHEN SCHRIFTSTELLER DER ERSTEN DREI JAHRHUNDERTE, herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Band 4: *Der Dialog des Adamantius:* Περὶ τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ὀρθῆς πίστεως. Herausg. von W. H. VAN DE SANDE BAKHUYZEN. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901. Pp. lvii + 256. M. 12.50.

IN a less critical age the dialogue of Adamantius *On Right Faith in God* would have appeared among the works of Origen. Adamantius was one of the names of Origen, and Rufinus translated this dialogue into Latin as a genuine work of Origen's. At least as early, then, as the close of the fourth century it was ascribed to Origen, and his responsibility for it does not seem to have been questioned till the time of Andreas Rivetus, to whose doubt Wettstein was the first to call attention. Rivetus urged the reference (872*a*) to Christian kings in the writer's day as decisive evidence against its being Origen's. Modern criticism, however, rejects the passage as the work of a reviser, and as early as 1685 critics based their denial of any connection of the work with Origen on irreconcilable differences in doctrine — *e. g.*, of the resurrection — between this dialogue and the genuine writings of that father.

The dialogue was composed by no very original author not earlier than Methodius' περὶ τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου and περὶ ἀναστάσεως — these supply

the *terminus a quo;* it was written before the end of the persecution of the Christians, that is, before the edict of Galerius, 311 A. D. This was also about the time of Methodius' death, so that the dialogue was probably written not far from the year 300, though it has since undergone some reworking. Its chief interest lies in the reflection of the teachings of Marcion and Valentinus, against whose heresies it is directed. Adamantius appears as the champion of the orthodox church against the Marcionites Megethius and Marcus, in public debate before an umpire of their own selection, the heathen Eutropius. Megethius maintains that there are three principles, the good God, the Demiurge, and the evil God; that the Old Testament precepts emanated from another God than those of the New, and that the father of Christ was another than the Creator of the world. These and other Gnostic positions taken by Megethius and Marcus are overthrown by Adamantius, to whom Eutropius awards the victory. In the second part of the dialogue, Marinus, a follower of Bardesanes, appears as the chief opponent of Adamantius. He advances three propositions: that the devil was not created by God; that Christ was not born of a woman; and that there is no resurrection of the body. Again Adamantius triumphs, and the umpire is so affected by his arguments as to seek admission to the church.

This and much more, by way of introduction to the dialogue, Bakhuyzen has given in a compact and comprehensive essay. In this is included a catalogue of the manuscripts of the dialogue and of the translations and editions, and upon it follows the text. The Greek occupies the left-hand page, and is accompanied by the Latin of Rufinus on the righ-hand page. The lower margin is devoted to textual notes. Indexes of Scripture passages quoted, names mentioned, and important words used, Greek as well as Latin, complete the book.

The ten Greek manuscripts of the dialogue go back to a lost exemplar which was itself very corrupt. They fall into three groups, of which the Venice manuscript (B) of the twelfth century, the oldest textual witness; the Bodleian manuscript (C) of the early sixteenth century; and the two Paris manuscripts (F H) of the sixteenth century, are severally the representatives. All the other manuscripts connect themselves more or less closely with the Venice manuscript. Upon these four representative codices, then, with some help for the latter part from the two works of Methodius mentioned above, Bakhuyzen has constructed his text. Of translations the earliest and

most important is that of Rufinus, which is more faithful than his translations of Origen's works, although in the longer speeches considerable liberties are taken. Rufinus' translation is here published on the basis of Caspari's edition. Adamantius enjoyed a singular revival in the sixteenth century, when no fewer than four new Latin translations of the dialogue were made — those of Picus, Perionius, Ferrarius, and Humfry. But the first edition of the Greek text did not appear until 1674, when the younger Wettstein published it from a manuscript no longer extant. In 1733 de la Rue included the dialogue in his edition of Origen's works, and Migne and Lommatzsch have added little to his work or that of Wettstein. There was thus a real need for a critical edition based on broader manuscript evidence and accompanied by an adequate introduction and apparatus of readings, and such an edition this newest volume of the Prussian Academy's series certainly is.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DAS TESTAMENT UNSERES HERRN UND DIE VERWANDTEN SCHRIFTEN. Von F. X. FUNK. (= "Forschungen zur christlichen Litteratur- und Dogmengeschichte." Herausgegeben von EHRHARD und KIRSCH. Zweiter Band. Erstes und zweites Heft.) Mainz: Kirchheim, 1901. Pp. xii+316. M. 16.

OF German scholars few were better prepared than Franz Xaver Funk, the Roman Catholic professor at Tübingen, successor to the well-known professor, afterward bishop, Hefele, to give a thoroughly intelligent verdict on the so-called "Testament of Our Lord," which has been introduced to the learned world with so much pretension by the Roman Catholic patriarch Rahmani of Antioch. As early as 1891 he had published a monograph of more than three hundred pages on the Apostolic Constitutions, with which the new document is closely connected, and never since has he lost sight of this kind of literature. Hence the title of the book: *Das Testament und die verwandten Schriften, i. e.*, the early Christian writings connected with it. The importance of Funk's book lies not so much in the elucidation he has given of the new text, as in the conclusions at which he arrives as to those kindred writings which have long been known. That the newly published Testament was not a work of the first or second century everyone saw at once, except the editor and the reviewer, as I see from the last page of Funk's book, in the *Dublin Review* (1900, pp. 245–74); and it does not matter much whether we refer it, with the bishop of